

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **29 January 2007**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-21. Claims 7, 14, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because there is insufficient antecedent basis for a limitation in the claim. Claims 1, 6-8, 13-15, and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-17, and 19-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ASP Alliance ("*Introduction to Validating User Input in Web Forms*", December 29, 2003, hereinafter "ASP"), in view of PBDR ("*SQL String Validation*", June 24 2003 hereinafter "PBDR"). Claims 4, 11, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ASP, in view of PDBR, and further in view of The PHP Group ("*Error Handling and Logging Functions*", November 27, 2003, hereinafter "PHP")

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Examiner rejected claims 1, 6-8, 13-15, and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. More specifically, Examiner pointed out that in the event that a signature is not located in a signature cache, there is no action leading to a tangible result. Examiner noted that claims 2, 9, and 16, if included in claims 1, 8, and 15, overcome this deficiency of the rejected claims.

In accordance with the examiners recommendation, Applicant has amended claims 1, 8, and 15 to include the limitations of dependent claims 2, 9, and 16, respectively. Hence, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Examiner rejected claims 7, 14, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because there is insufficient antecedent basis for the “if the signature generates a mismatch alert” limitation in the claims.

Applicant has amended claim 1 as described above, thereby rendering the rejection moot. Hence, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-17, and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over ASP in view of PBDR. Applicant respectfully points out that embodiments of the present invention are fundamentally distinct from the combination disclosed by ASP and PBDR. The combination disclosed by ASP and PBDR is confined to providing limited error checking of user entries in a web form.

In the following section, Applicant specifically addresses the rejection of claim 6, where Examiner uses the following language from ASP:

“Validation controls perform input checking in server code. When the user submits a form to the server, the validation controls are invoked to review the user’s input, control by control” (emphasis on directly quoted section added by Applicant (see ASP page 2, lines 36-37)

to characterize the system disclosed by ASP as initializing the signature cache by recording the signatures of valid transactions during a system initialization option (see page 6 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully avers that **“reviewing user input” using a series of validation controls is entirely unrelated to initializing a signature cache**. In fact, this language from ASP actually indicates that a user input can be tested for formatting errors using existing validation controls, such as “testing for valid dates or values within a range” (see ASP page

1, lines 6-8). Applicant further avers that there is nothing in ASP or PBDR, alone or in concert, which suggests initializing a signature cache.

In contrast, embodiments of the present invention provide a system that initializes a signature cache by: (1) trapping database queries in a controlled environment; (2) parsing the database queries to produce a set of valid signatures; and (3) storing the valid signatures in the signature cache (see at least FIG. 5 and par. [0035] of the instant application). By initializing a signature cache in this way, embodiments of the present invention capture a more complete and accurate set of database query signatures.

Accordingly, applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 to clarify that the present invention initializes a signature cache. These amendments find support in par. [0035] and FIG. 5 of the instant application. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 9-14, which depend upon claim 8, and claims 16-21, which depend upon claim 15, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 30 April 2007

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com